

judgment interest at the statutory rate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961. (*Id.* at 3). Neither party has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.¹

After reviewing the record, the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Lee's report and recommendation. The Court hereby **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Lee's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b). Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment (Doc. 19) is hereby **GRANTED**.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a), the Court will set forth a separate document entering judgment in favor of Plaintiff against Defendants.

SO ORDERED this 3rd day of January, 2013.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised the parties that they had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive the parties' respective appellate rights. (Doc. 25 at 3 n.2); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings"). Taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which the parties' could timely file objections expired on November 30, 2012.